

lishment of the four-star cyber command -- the sub-unified command under STRATCOM. We are awaiting the confirmation of its first director by the Senate.

And we -- the QDR, I think, makes very clear that we regard the cyber problem and cyber space as a huge problem going forward. And there are substantial resources in the budget for cyber both for people and capabilities.

REP. LANGEVIN: Thank you. I yield back.

REP. SKELTON: I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Hunter.

REP. DUNCAN HUNTER (R-CA): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And gentlemen, thanks for being here.

Admiral Mullen, thank you, sir. My little brother's on his, I think, six months out of one year in -- (inaudible) -- right now for a STRYKER brigade and he appreciates everything that you do. And so does his wife and two little girls and his unborn son here that they've had while he's been in the Army. I appreciate everything that you do.

And Mr. Secretary, thank you, sir, for everything that you do.

The thing that concerns me -- and I'm only going to touch on this to preface this statement -- is that the Senate Armed Services Committee has now had a full-hour hearing, full committee, on don't ask, don't tell. In this committee here or in that Senate committee, we have yet to have a full committee on IEDs -- the number one cause of death and casualties over in Iraq and Afghanistan. Last year we had 322 killed because of roadside bombs; 1,818 maimed and wounded. This year just in January 32 KIA and 137 wounded.

I understand that there's a lot of budget issues; there's a lot of social issues that you have to work through, but I would like to make it so that our priority isn't the social issues in the military. The budget issues are important, but I think when you have 18 and 19 years old and my little brother and my friends and family -- and many of us have the exact same out there fighting -- I think our priorities should be with winning.

JIEDDO -- the Joint IED Defeat Organization -- has gotten over \$17.2 billion since its inception. It's got a staff of 4,800 people. And what I would like to know, Mr. Secretary and Admiral, is do you think that they are living up to the standards that we set for them when they were created? And do you think that they're doing what they should be doing?

And I commend you, Mr. Secretary, you had the ISR Task Force, Counter IED Task Force. I met with Dr. Carter, General Paxton. They've been very helpful and I know that this is one of your number- one priorities.

So what are we doing right now, because, Mr. Secretary, you're in that chain of command coming down from President Obama to where you can mobilize the industrial base and you can mobilize our military technology people and our military and you can give orders to say, we're going to stop IEDs and here's how we're going to do it: We're going to have 24-hours surveillance; we're going to have persistent surveillance.

So sir, that is my question: Is JIEDDO living up to what it should be doing to the amount of money that it's been given and what more can we do to protect our men and women that are out there fighting every day?

SEC. GATES: I think JIEDDO is doing what they've been asked to do and I think they're doing a good job of it. But JIEDDO is not the answer to the problem alone.

And as you've suggested, ISR capabilities are very important. We have basically maxed out the production capability. We are pushing everything we can into that area. I met with Dr. Carter and General Paxton last week. There are a portfolio of capabilities that I told them to proceed with buying -- including significantly increased number of aerostats that can provide persistent coverage. A variety of similar -- a variety of other sensors that can be used to have persistent coverage in the vicinity of our forward-operating bases and so on. And I have told them not to worry about the money and not to worry about the numbers, but to just get them out there as fast as possible. And they are proceeding to do that.

There are a lot of other aspects of this. One is the -- unlike Iraq, the primary substance for IEDs in Afghanistan is ammonium nitrate. It's illegal in Afghanistan and so we are now forming task forces -- General McChrystal is forming task forces to try and break the smuggling networks for ammonium nitrate. One of our MRAPs that was blown in half -- it was 1,500 pounds of this stuff. And so that's another threat.

We need to get more labs into Afghanistan. We had a lot of labs to deal with the IED forensics in Iraq and we've not been quick enough to get those labs up and running in Afghanistan.

So the purpose of appointing Dr. Carter and General Paxton to look at this is that there are a number of different elements of the Pentagon who are working the IED effort. And I think each of them in their own way is doing a good job. The trouble is I don't think that effort has been sufficiently integrated across all of these different lines of effort. And one of the things that I have asked them to do is when their task force stands down, what do we do to make sure there is somebody applying a blowtorch to this issue in the E ring to make sure that these different parts are talking to each other and that the equipment is flowing to General McChrystal as quickly as possible.

The other concept that they've come up with that I think has a lot of merit is basically a warehouse approach to counter-IED equipment at the battalion level, so that a whole array of equipment is available to the different teams that go out so that they can pick and choose the equipment that is most appropriate to the kind of terrain they're going to be on that day.

REP. HUNTER: Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

REP. SKELTON: I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Sestak.

REP. JOE SESTAK (D-PA): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, on "Don't ask, don't tell," thank you for the effort you and the admiral have done. I have a question, and I very -- I liked your explanation of how to change an institution as far as a massive change comes about. At the same time, I thought the chairman said very well the other day this is a matter of integrity. You're asking someone to live a lie, as well as an institution is abiding that, or words to that effect.

We are able to turn on a dime and fix protocols right away, as you just mentioned, because we didn't do them well for that terrorist on that aircraft. So I wondered, if this is a matter of principle, equality, can't we turn more rapidly rather than wait a year to have to do a study on implementing?

If not, would you support the president issuing an executive order under stop -- what do they call it? -- stop loss so that we don't have these individuals, that will soon be permitted to stay, being pushed out?

SEC. GATES: Well, first of all, Congress passed a stop-loss law a decade before it passed "Don't ask, don't tell." And it's the view of the general counsel at the Department of Defense that the president would not have the authority to do that, to do an executive order.

REP. SESTAK: Under stop loss.

SEC. GATES: Under stop loss.

REP. SESTAK: If you did --

SEC. GATES: I said we would deliver -- I said we would complete this review before the end of the calendar year. I don't know how long it's going to take. All I know is I want it to be thorough and I want to have the opportunity to have the kind of dialogue with our men and women in uniform and their families to assess the facts in this situation. We are going to redo the RAND study of 1993 with a much-expanded charter, as Mr. McKeon has asked for. And I think it is -- we are not delaying this, but it is important to do it right. And I --

REP. SESTAK: I wasn't trying to insinuate that anyone was delaying it; just we tend to have a military that's very ready to do things, and it just seemed to be -- and I really thought you spoke well of it is a matter of integrity.

If I could, just because I only have a moment, my second question has to do with General Pace testified here -- and he may have been alongside you, sir -- that we could not meet our warfare commitments with the Army for, like, 5027 in South Korea, but that the Air Force and the Navy and the others could back that up with acceptable risk. And I think you even may have testified that way, Mr. Chairman.

With the draw-down in Iraq and with the amount that we're putting into Afghanistan, which I support, when will we be able to meet that and other commitments that we once did prior to the conflict of Iraq beginning, so that we do have an Army that is able to meet its other commitments in terms of readiness to do so without asking the other units, services, to fill in?

SEC. GATES: Let me respond, and then quickly the chairman.

I think what we have testified to, including General Pace, was that we could not get the Army units required for South Korea into South Korea on the time line required by the plan. That's not to say they wouldn't get there. It's just that they wouldn't get there as quickly because of the commitments that we have in Iraq and Afghanistan. And so certainly initially we would be especially dependent on the Navy and the Air Force.

ADM. MULLEN: And I would only add that, as you look at the time line that you just described -- end of '11, Army's out of -- we're out of Iraq -- it's the beginning of reset, really, for the Army in terms of equipment and actually training. And there's a full-spectrum training. Both the Army and Marine Corps just have not --

REP. SESTAK: Haven't been doing.

ADM. MULLEN: -- have not been doing that. So --

REP. SESTAK: It's fair to say a number of years.

ADM. MULLEN: Ideally, probably a year or two before we're well into that, to be able to do it on something that -- on a time line we choose. We don't always get that choice.

REP. SESTAK: One last question. Actually, it's two, but I've run out of time. The Pakistan -- you mentioned the benchmarks that you had thought had come (over ?), and I think we got a draft of them, actually, in September. I honestly feel the increase in troops has almost more to do with Pakistan, and it's really the linchpin of success for us over there, more so than Afghanistan, in whether al Qaeda is eradicated by them with our assistance.

Are the benchmarks also -- which I didn't see in the draft that came across for Pakistan -- and the success that we can measure or the failure or the cost for that, (as ?) that's so critical a part of it also?

SEC. GATES: Let me check and get you an answer for the record.

REP. SESTAK: Thank you.

REP. : The gentleman's time has expired.

The gentleman from Arizona, Mr. Franks, for five minutes.

REP. TRENT FRANKS (R-AZ): Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And thank all of you for all that you do for the country.

Admiral Mullen, if it's all right, I'll address you first, sir. You indicated in your submitted testimony on page 14 that you're growing concerned about the defense-industrial base, particularly in ship-building and space. And, of course, I share those concerns. I'm concerned that the ship requirements haven't changed since 2006. And while there's been significant growth in the demand and emphasis for Aegis ships to support BMD missions, in fact, the QDR doesn't reflect an increase in Navy ships to reflect the increased mission requirements.

The Ballistic Missile Defense review acknowledges a range of ballistic missile threats with growing capabilities and inventory, so there's obviously a need for the U.S. to invest in robust missile defenses. But the budget doesn't seem to indicate that.

And I'm just wondering, in terms of investing in our architecture that supports BMD, are you concerned that we're overburdening the Aegis ships with the addition of BMD missions without providing any additional resources or infrastructure to support the growing mission? And with the addition of BMD missions added to Aegis ships, how many more ships do you think might be needed?

ADM. MULLEN: As I said, I think I said earlier that I think it's important we upgrade the ships that we have. I think we have 84 Aegis ships -- I may get that wrong by a number or two -- but making as many of them missile-defense-capable as possible, at the level that we're upgrading. The 23 going to three more is a key piece. And that's the fleet that we have right now. I think it's to be determined how big the fleet should be with respect to additional ships that meet this requirement, which I talked about earlier.

And I am, as I said earlier, long term, concerned about the industrial base -- have been concerned about the industrial base in ship-building and in space, and that we need to certainly incorporate that into our thinking as to how we invest, because without a decent industrial base, we can't move forward on the systems that we need.

I think we'll know a lot more about the missile-defense piece in particular, and we've invested some eight and a half billion dollars in a year in MDA this year; bought the standard missiles, bought the THAAD missiles and batteries. So there's been a significant investment. I look to a future where that would continue.

REP. FRANKS: Well, I was somewhat pleasantly surprised that there was an increase in the missile-defense budget. I'm glad to see that.

Mr. Secretary, according to The Wall Street Journal, an article published yesterday, the U.S. and Russia have reached an agreement in principle on START. The delivery systems would fall sharply to between 700 and 800 each. However, today the U.S. deploys about 880 launchers when ghost or phantom systems are taken off the books. And this is a pretty significant reduction to our current nuclear deterrence.

Where will these 10 to 25 percent cuts in the current nuclear triad be made?

SEC. GATES: Let me just open and then ask the chairman to respond.

First of all, the agreement -- there is not a concluded agreement yet. There are still several areas not yet agreed. So the agreement is still -- has not been finished.

REP. FRANKS: Mr. Secretary, before I let you -- I'd be glad to hear Admiral Mullen's response, but before I let you go, can you provide this committee with an assurance that the administration will not seek a side agreement with Russia outside of START that would limit our missile-defense capabilities?

SEC. GATES: There will be no agreement of any kind that limits our missile-defense capabilities.

REP. FRANKS: Good enough. Thank you, sir.

ADM. MULLEN: I would only ask -- or I would only add that in the negotiations in which I have participated and worked very closely with the secretary and the chiefs, and STRATCOM, General Chilton, to look to how we would conclude this -- and overall, the entire architecture is taken into consideration. Again, we're not entirely through this, but we recognize the significance and the importance of the triad in needing to sustain that.

REP. FRANKS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I guess I'll just throw one more question. Russia now relies on its overwhelming inventory of tactical nuclear weapons. The strategic commission estimates Russia has approximately 3,800 tactical nuclear weapons, while the U.S. has probably less than 500.

While the U.S. reduces both its strategic and tactical nuclear forces, it seems that Russia continues to have the carte blanche to increase its inventory of tactical nuclear weapons. How does the administration and the Pentagon plan to address this issue? And I'll address it to you, Mr. Secretary, and then you can pass it to Admiral Mullen if you choose.

ADM. MULLEN: Certainly I'm very aware of that concern. The negotiations that we are in right now (as START follow-on ?), they're the strategic weapons, and I assure you that that concern has been raised.

My own view of that is that conclusion of this agreement opens the door to additional opportunities, specifically with Russia, and as was asked earlier -- asked about earlier, in Europe. And I would hope that concluding this then allows us to proceed ahead in a way that addresses some of those other concerns, to include the number of tactical nuclear missiles -- the weapons that Russia has.

REP. SKELTON: The gentleman's time has expired.

SEC. GATES: I would just add that this is one of the reasons that I answered a question I did earlier about my view that the NATO alliance needs to retain a nuclear capability.

REP. FRANKS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

REP. SKELTON: The gentleman from Virginia, Mr. Nye. Five minutes.

REP. GLENN NYE (D-VA): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Secretary and Admiral, thank you for being here. Appreciate your dedication to our country's national security. The QDR is a 20-year, long-term forward-looking planning document. Following up on Mr. Whitman's questions regarding the home-porting question, and I agree with Mr. Whitman's assessment that it appears that the QDR, the one single sentence in the QDR that has to do with home-porting East Coast carriers was added in a very, very late draft.

Just noting that, Mr. Secretary, you said today that in your discussions with the Secretary of the Navy and the CNO, they had told you that that project was a priority for them, even when you asked them to compare it with some other things. Can you tell us what other things did you ask them to compare it to, that they would rank lower than this in priority?

SEC. GATES: No, I didn't ask them to specify. I just said compared to your other priorities, where does this fit?

REP. NYE: Okay. Noting that there is a sentence in the QDR identifying this as a project of interest to the Navy, can you help me understand why there is no request for the 2011 budget for MILCON to further the project?

ADM. MULLEN: There's \$239 million of MILCON in the fit-up, and I believe planning money, \$2 million in fiscal 2011, and there would be MILCON and beyond fiscal 2015 as well, as well as some other costs, PCS, et cetera, but there is money in the fit-up.

REP. NYE: But can you clarify why there's no money for MILCON in the 2011 budget?

ADM. MULLEN: I believe there's \$2 million for planning and design funding, is the figures I've gotten.

SPEAKER: My take on that is that's been a part of this overall decision, if you will, in terms of when this would be done, what budget it would be done, et cetera. Navy's been working for this for years, and that the money now is allocated against the plan to do this. The only other thing I would add about the change from the draft document to the final document, to the best of my knowledge -- I've kind of walked my way from north to south -- there's only one other port on the East Coast of this country that could accommodate another carrier.

So I don't necessarily see that the change in the document is that significant because Mayport has been it and is it, and it just identifies it.

SEC. GATES: And I would just point out, you're going to have, I think, Undersecretary Flournoy and company up here to brief on the QDR. My guess is that the change took place because in the final weeks of the QDR is when it was being coordinated with the services and the combatant commanders. We wanted their input very much, and so that may have reflected service input in the coordination process.

REP. NYE: I guess my question is along these lines. If it's a priority, as you've said, Mr. Secretary, I'm having a hard time understanding why the process has been allowed to continue to slide as it has, and why no request for going ahead with MILCON this year.

SEC. GATES: Well, you've got to plan it before you can build it.

REP. NYE: Admiral Mullen, I just want to follow up actually on a comment that you had made to Mr. Whitman as well and I just wanted to make sure I understand what you meant, and just to clarify. You said that judgment is a factor -- an individual judgment is of course a factor in any risk assessment. I just wanted to make sure you didn't mean by that to suggest that it would replace an analytical study of risk.

ADM. MULLEN: No. I think -- I've spent a lot of time on how we assess risk, and there are analytics which can support it, and it's not individual judgment. It's professional judgment, and oftentimes the result of a lot of very senior people with experience in this business that make the judgment. But it's not going to come out to a specific number.

REP. NYE: Okay. And again, that is, I think -- an analytical study is something that we've been asking for for some time, to help us judge. As a Congress we've got to make some decisions about how we're going to spend defense dollars in conjunction with your recommendations. But we're talking about approximately \$1 billion of investment, and that's a lot of money, especially considering the situation that our country faces right now.

And just one last follow-up, Admiral Mullen. Can you just help me understand why -- an individual's judgment could of course be applied to any risk analysis, why wouldn't that apply to in terms of strategic dispersal, strategy bomber fleet, or East Coast nuclear missile submarines, or indeed, a number of other assets that we have there --

ADM. MULLEN: I think it applies in many, many areas. This is one specific focus area, obviously, because of the high level of interest, and I get paid to make those kind of judgment calls and risk calls throughout my life as a military leader, and do here as well, as do others.

REP. NYE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back.

REP. SKELTON: Thank you. Mr. Coffman for five minutes.

REP. MIKE COFFMAN (R-CO): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And Secretary Gates and Admiral Mullen, thank you so much for your service to this country.

My first question is related to the QDR, and that is, the future of the United States Marine Corps and whether or not we will have forced entry capability in terms of amphibious warfare, and if so, we're going to retain that capability, then what about the expeditionary fighting vehicle? So can you all just comment on that concern?

ADM. MULLEN: When you say future of the Marine Corps, I think of an awful lot of things. Certainly where the Marine Corps is right now, and General Conway says this as well, it's far too heavy from where the Marine Corps both started and wants to be in the future. Most of us believe that it has to have some kind of forcible entry capability. That usually gets into how much amphibious lift do you have, and I believe we have it about right. And the other piece is the EFV.

I mean, I've been alongside EFV for a number of years. It's a program that has also exploded in costs. We've asked it to do a lot. The requirements have grown, and it has certainly come under visibility many times in terms of whether we should keep it as we make this trade. Certainly having some kind of capability of maneuvering to shore as the EFV does I think in the future is important.

What's the vehicle? EFV is it right now, and it's in the program. But I also think there are limits about how much money we can spend there. General Conway wants to get to a point, post-Afghanistan, if you will, where the Marine Corps is a lot lighter. It has gotten a lot heavier. So there's a lot of work to do about what the future of the Marine Corps looks like, specifically not just tied to one vehicle or one shipyard.

REP. COFFMAN: Thank you, Admiral Mullen. I just want to stress that I do believe that the Marine Corps obviously needs a replacement for its current amphibious vehicle if we are to maintain that amphibious warfare capability in terms of an imposed landing.

A concern of mine in terms of PTSD, and that is, going to a different subject -- and that is it seems to me that with the proper treatment I think a lot of it is reversible, but yet we seem to be discharging a fairly significant number of military personnel with PTSD with no -- and this goes on, I guess, beyond the Department of Defense, in terms of the Veterans Administration, with no real capability, or no ability for treatment, that it's not being funded.

So it's certainly not fair to those of us -- those who serve this country, and certainly is ultimately not fair to the taxpayers in the United States. So I wonder if you could comment on where we are in terms of PTSD, and are we making advances.

SEC. GATES: We both probably should take a crack at this. First of all, VA has put a lot of money into this and they have hired a lot of mental health care providers, and I give VA a lot of credit. They've made enormous progress, I would say, in the last 18 months or so. And General Shinseki, Secretary Shinseki has really attached a very high priority to this, as did his predecessor.

We have I think roughly \$1 billion in the budget specifically allocated to PTSD and traumatic brain injury. I think we all take this very seriously. We still -- I would say that the two problems we face are not enough mental health care providers, and it's not for lack of trying to hire them. We are out there scouring the country. We have a national shortage, if you will, and we're looking at ways to improve that.

Then the other problem that we have is still the issue of stigma. Despite the leadership of the services and service leaders, and I would say commanders at all levels, and the fact that the leadership of the Army and the Marine Corps in particular get this. But there is still this strong culture and getting these young men and women to acknowledge they have a problem and seek treatment is still an obstacle in front of us.

ADM. MULLEN: Huge problem. We're on our way, but we've got a long way to go. And it actually extends -- we've seen it extend to families, quite frankly. And the stigma issue, I sat with a soldier the other day who was wounded, 2005, I think, 2006, who just finally raised his hand. He's

still active duty, and he finally raised his hand and said, "I need help." It took him that long to do that, and that's the stigma issue. And we'd like to figure out a way where that can be addressed a whole lot earlier.

The fact of the matter is, the sooner you address it, the less likely the longer-term impacts are out there to occur.

So that's been the real problem. But the stigma issue continues to be one that's a hurdle we have not gotten close to getting over.

REP. SKELTON: Mr. Hunter, for five minutes.

REP. HUNTER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you, Secretary Gates and Admiral Mullen, Under Secretary Hale. I really appreciate your service and your willingness to make some really tough choices this year.

As you know, our military involvement in places like Iraq and Afghanistan has placed a premium on close air support mission. And I wanted to ask, in recognition of this, it states in the QDR that "the Air Force will field light mobility and light attack aircraft in general purpose force units in order to increase their ability to work effectively with the wider range of partner air forces." Can either of you talk a little bit about the need for this sort of aircraft and what you foresee as the future of light attack armor reconnaissance in the U.S. military.

ADM. MULLEN: I think, if we're talking about the same thing here, we really are talking about aircraft which better match up with some of our coalition partners, specifically. It's interesting, I had a conversation the other day. This QDR gets reviewed by an awful lot of countries. It's not just here inside the Department or on Capitol Hill but other countries look to the United States about where it's going, and there are discussions, and I won't name the country, but a discussion in that country about how it moves ahead and how can it complement what we're doing, as opposed to compete with us or match us sort of capability to capability.

And this is an ally. This is not an enemy or a potential enemy, so I think it's more focused on trying to match up with other countries with less-capable, so to speak, but still capable enough kinds of aircraft, which is where this particular aircraft I think you're talking about is going. I think, if I have that right.

SEC. GATES: Yeah, and I think this is really more about training them on them and then helping them buy them for their own forces because they're easier to maintain, simpler to fly, and just not as complex as the aircraft we fly.

REP. HUNTER: Got you.

Secretary Gates, I think last year you announced that the DOD was canceling the CRX program, the Air Force CRX and that the Department would, I think your quote was look at whether there is a requirement for a specialized search and rescue aircraft along the lines of what the Air Force had in mind and whether it would be a joint capability or not. Can you talk a little bit about what determinations have been made at this point and where we're going with that capability in the future?

SEC. GATES: I'll have to get you an answer for the record, but my impression -- and maybe the chairman or Mr. Hale can correct me, but my impression is that the Air Force has opted to buy some additional helicopters for their own search and rescue.

ADM. MULLEN: Well, there has been some additional investment, and 60 specifically for search and rescue. And then I think the question for the record is the plan was to look at this longer term to see where we would go from a joint perspective, and we're not there yet.

REP. HUNTER: Okay. Mr. Chairman, I'll yield back the balance of my time.

REP. SKELTON: The gentleman yields back. Mr. Platts from Pennsylvania.

REP. TODD RUSSELL PLATTS (R-PA): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I certainly want to thank all three of the witnesses for your great leadership and service to our nation. We're blessed by what you're doing, and the men and women in uniform certainly are, by your leadership.

A couple quick comments. First, I want to associate myself with the comments of Mr. Rogers from Alabama on the issue of Gitmo. Given the financial strains facing our country, the thought of spending \$400, \$500 million on establishing a new prison when we have one that the military is operating with great efficiency and security just seems pretty illogical to me, and back home I always - the common sense test doesn't get passed with that proposal, so I hope that money will be available to some of the other needs that you've outlined in your budget.

I just returned last night from a Pakistan/Afghanistan CODEL. Lynch -- Congressman Lynch led a great bipartisan team. Very insightful. I come back, as always -- this is my sixth trip to Afghanistan -- inspired by what our men and women in uniform are doing. We got down to FOB Spin Bulldack (ph), and a 19-year-old Army soldier driving the striker that I was in, as we got out to Shaman Gate to see the logistics channel there of all the materials, you can't be anything but inspired and so grateful for these heroic Americans. A couple observations.

One is, I came back with great confidence in our team we have there. Our time with Ambassador Eikenberry, his insights, having been a commander on the ground there and now on the diplomatic side, just exceptional and we didn't get to see General McChrystal, who wasn't in theatre, but General Bill Caldwell, and if there's something that became crystal clear of our success in Afghanistan, it's the efforts of General Caldwell and the training of the Afghanistan security forces. And I'm delighted we have somebody of his great caliber in that role. I think that's one of the linchpins to the success that we're going to achieve is what he's doing.

The one thing I wanted to mention is acquisition reform is a big part of what you've talked about in both of your testimonies and how we need to do a lot better. And I often think that sometimes on the ground we learn what works and then translate it to a bigger picture, and Major General McDonald, who we met with, I wouldn't use his title and the military's famous for their acronyms, but the ICJLPSB, Interagency Combined Joint Logistics Procurement Support Board, but when we met with them and all that sit in this organization, they've put together for acquisitions and how they are truly troubleshooting and getting what the military needs on the ground and for the best price for American taxpayers, all of us came away extremely impressed and that's the short diagram of what they're doing.

I would just say that back home here at the Pentagon, we may want to talk to General McDonald and the success he's having in the field coordinating acquisition and apply it to the bigger picture throughout DOD.

A specific request that we promised to pass on when we returned: our ambassador to Romania -- we stopped in Bucharest on the way and very enlightening, how supportive they are to our military

efforts, including in Afghanistan and broader issues in the European Theatre. The specific issue that we promised to pass on was the issue of the Romanian forces who are patrolling Highway 1 in Afghanistan and a standing request that's working its way through the channels on some of the initial AMRAPs that for what they're doing, the highway. Not the ATV versions and the newer versions for Afghanistan but some that we're pulling out of Iraq.

They're looking for a dozen, 15 or so, and as we came to understand and appreciate their commitment to this joint effort, it's something we promised to pass on to the leadership when we returned home from that trip. Appreciate the efforts in trying to work with our Romanian partners and their needs.

SEC. GATES: When this hearing is over, I leave for Istanbul for a NATO defense ministers' meeting and one of the initiatives that I'm going to announce there is we have taken a look at what more we can do share what we've learned and our counter IED capabilities with our partners in Afghanistan, and I will be telling the other 27 defense ministers that this is important for us and within the framework, obviously, of the law, there is more we can do to help them and we will.

REP. PLATTS: Wonderful, Mr. Secretary.

MR. MULLEN: And the only other thing I would add is I was with my Romanian counterpart last week in Brussels, and we've talked about the AMRAP issue many times. We're doing as much as we can to get them what they need. It's significant that they now want to actually buy them and at the same time our priorities have been to get them to our forces first and then their --

REP. PLATTS: Understood.

MR. MULLEN: -- because they really need them, and I think we'll get there.

REP. PLATTS: The ambassador had just returned from presenting a bronze star for us to two soldiers, Romanian soldiers that had given their lives, to the widows of the soldiers who had given their lives, so thank you, Mr. Chairman. Again, thanks for your leadership for our nation.

REP. SKELTON: Thank the gentleman. Before I call on the gentle lady from Guam, I don't believe it's been touched on yet. Let's talk about the DDG 1000 program if we may. It was truncated last year, if you will recall, at three vessels, and we received notice yesterday that due to the termination, the remaining four vessels of the DDG 1000 will suffer a cost growth and they'll all have to be either terminated or recertified.

Do you know where we are on that whole program? And I understand that there's a possibility of the AG 51s being reconfigured and taking its place. Can you tell me or tell this committee where we are on that because I know that's going to be a major issue.

SEC. GATES: Mr. Chairman, as of walking into this hearing, my assumption was that the program we announced last year of three DDG 1000s was on track, that we were doing all three of them. The information that you cite from yesterday I haven't heard, so I'll have to check.

REP. SKELTON: Admiral, do you know anything about it?

MR. MULLEN: Well, to some degree -- I shouldn't do this, but I think what you're looking at are termination costs that are given at the termination of the program, and whether you build three or a hundred of something, at the end of the program, you have to pay this and so it sounds like it's coming in from that perspective. I honestly don't know.

I know that the CNO is looking at possibly the DDG 51 hull for the future.

This program also has the cruiser cancellation, the issue being, what's the ship that's going to bear the radar for the future, a big piece of which will be missile defense. That's about all I know right now.

SEC. GATES: Mr. Chairman, I've just been reminded that the issue that has come up is, and that has raised concerns, is that the program is going to breach Nunn- McCurdy. But it is going to breach, not because of performance issues, but because of the reduction in the buy. And as far as I know, our plan is to continue to go forward with it.

REP. SKELTON: Okay. Thank you. I asked the question because I'm sure that will come up in at least one of our subcommittees.

The gentle lady from Guam, Ms. Bordallo.

DEL. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO (D-GUAM): Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Secretary Gates and Admiral Mullen, thank you for your testimony today. I would like to begin, of course, with the Guam military build-up. I arrived yesterday afternoon, after spending days on Guam. In fact, I held five town meetings to allow my constituents an opportunity to discuss and share their concerns about the Draft EIS. While I believe that many remain supportive of the overall goals of the military build-up, they are extremely concerned about certain aspects of it and its impact on Guam's culture and environment.

I'm working with all of the local leaders to form a consensus on the way forward with the Draft EIS and make sure that there is one message from the people of Guam. Now, I believe that this consensus will force DOD to look very closely at some of the assumptions in the Draft EIS. As I have stated, and as Chairman Skelton has reiterated time and time again, we must get this build-up done right. However, the current Draft EIS does not accomplish that goal in totality.

I need to make it clear that I will oppose any effort by the DOD to utilize the power of eminent domain to acquire private or government of Guam land. In fact, I would encourage the department to look harder at keeping the military within its existing footprint on Guam. I also encourage the department to look at other alternatives for the transit carrier berthing in Apra Harbor to further mitigate coral and critical habitat loss. And I understand the department's position on the Futenma Replacement Facility has evolved, and the U.S. is willing to wait until May for a final decision from the new government in Japan.

I also understand that if alternatives are proposed for the FRF, that the U.S. would be willing to make changes to the Guam International Agreement to accommodate the Government of Japan's counter proposal. So first, my question is, what has led to this evolution in strategy regarding the government of Guam? And also, are you willing to seriously consider counter proposals that I and other government of Guam officials will propose in our official comments on the Draft EIS and act on them? If we are willing to give Japan extra time, I hope that we can give Guam the same courtesy.

So, I guess, Secretary Gates, this would be a question for you.

SEC. GATES: Well, I think, I met with the governor a year or so ago and told him that I thought it was important for us to have transparency and also for us to take into account the views

of the people of Guam, and so I stand by those comments. I would just say that while, with respect to Futenma, that we are willing to be patient.

We have a new government in Tokyo. The security alliance with Japan, we just observed the 50th anniversary a couple of weeks ago. So, the alliance is important to us, but we negotiated a long time on this, and we have no counter proposals from Japan, and so we are willing to give this some time to see how things play out in Tokyo. I don't know if you want to --

DEL. BORDALLO: Good. Thank you.

ADM. MULLEN: The only thing, ma'am, I think you know this probably as well as or better than anybody else, how critical Guam is to us, and the relationship with those who live there, unbelievably strong supporters. Not just local citizens but so many who serve in our military.

And Guam plays now and will continue to play a pivotal role in this strategic lash-up in that part of the world. And I would just emphasize or add to what the Secretary said in terms of transparency and understanding, and as we move through these, these are major moves we want to get right, because they're going to be out there for a long time.

DEL. BORDALLO: Thank you. And one other question. It's on a separate matter. It's for either Secretary Gates or Admiral Mullen. As you may be aware, Congressman Fleming and I have established the Long Range Strike Caucus to focus on the long range strike capabilities. And I note with concern, Secretary Gates, in your statement yesterday before the Senate, that the IOC for this platform will be delayed nearly a decade.

The bomber is valuable for strike missions, and I would like to know from you, what is the timeline for completing this study, and what factors and assumptions are being considered as this study is being conducted? I just have that feeling that this initiative is going to fall victim to the typical Washington syndrome of too many studies and too little action.

SEC. GATES: Well, what the, both the QDR and the budget provide for is a family of long range strike initiatives, and the things that we are looking at, there are some pretty substantial questions. Should it be standoff or attack? Should it be manned or remotely piloted? So there are some fairly fundamental issues. We have money in the budget, as we mentioned earlier, for both B-2 and B-52 modernization, and so, we're looking at something that will be in our inventory until 2060 or 2070 and so, and based on the life of the B- 52, it may be there until 2100.

But all kidding aside, I think that the key is trying to figure out what the right technologies are for the future. We have put money, we worked with this committee in particular to put money in the budget, to sustain the technology base in industry, in terms of materials and so on, so that we will still have those choices.

REP. SKELTON: (Sounds gavel.)

DEL. BORDALLO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

REP. SKELTON: Thank you.

Mr. Conaway.

REP. K. MICHAEL CONAWAY (R-TX): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Gentlemen, thanks for being here. Your patience and endurance is admirable, to wade through six hours of this deal.

Mr. Secretary, the Department of Defense is unauditible. Now, that may sound like a strange question or comment to make. I can't imagine you were briefed on this idea coming in, but it's got to be at least as important as Don't Ask, Don't Tell. There's \$636 billion dollars that we spend every year, and we don't know that we spend it correctly. The only way that's going to happen, and there's a law on the books right now that says by 2017, the Department of Defense and all of its variety of agencies have to be clean audits.

But that doesn't happen unless we get told from the top, unless the top guy, you, look at Mr. Hale and say, "Mr. Hale, we've really got to add this to all the other things that you've got going on that are important." But you can't make, I can't make good decisions on bad data. And the data that you're getting is coming from a myriad of systems and programs that have been cobbled together over 50 years. I've worked, had conversations with the folks over at the Office of Business Transformation. They've got the responsibility to get it done and the authority to simply cajole everybody in your system to get it done.

And so, the broad comment is, and I don't expect any answers other than that you see this as an important issue. I tried to get the time frame shortened from 2017 to 2013, and it blew up the other side of this building. The Senate came unwrapped over that reason, for some reason. But this is important and decisions are, better decisions are made with better data, and the data you're getting right now is, as I said, unauditible.

I do want to make one comment. I have been told --- I haven't confirmed this independently -- I've been told that the Marine Corps has said they're going to get it done sooner than later. So there are some individual branches and individual entities within the system that are making progress, but without your commitment to push on it, it won't get done. So, your thoughts.

SEC. GATES: As the former chairman of a number of corporate audit committees, I feel pretty strongly about this, and the fact is that for certainly the last several years, there has been a program under way to be able to produce clean audits. My impression has been that there has been steady progress and that there are a growing number of units that are able to do that. But let me ask Mr. Hale to give you a 30-second update on where that process stands.

MR. HALE: Well, can I start by saying that one of the key things, which is, are we spending the money the way Congress tells us, have been auditable and are auditable. It's called appropriations received, the IG reviewed it several years ago. So, I think you can be assured that we are spending the money in the manner in which we are directed by law.

What we can't do is the transaction base and various other requirements that are needed if you're going to pass a private sector audit test. What I did when I came into this job is realized, frankly, we were spending a lot of time and money trying to clean up data and audit it in areas where the data wasn't very useful to management.

So we've refocused it on the budgetary information, which we use every day to manage the Department of Defense. And you're right the Marine Corps has asserted audit readiness for its so-called statement of budgetary resources for fiscal '10. And they'll be a major test. The Army Corps of Engineers has a clean audit on all of its statements. And we're working with the other military departments. But the systems rolled and it will take awhile to get this.

REP. CONAWAY: Exactly, but tone comes from the top and emphasis comes from the top and from Congress. And I'm the one guy who serves on Intel and the Armed Services Committee, the CCPA. And so, this is going to be a continuing --

MR. HALE: It is on our 10 -- we've got a list with OMB of our 10 top priorities for business improvement; it is on it.

REP. CONAWAY: Okay. A couple of nits and nats. The written testimony says that we're going to buy an F-35, a Joint Strike Fighter with OCO money, overseas contingency operations money.

SEC. GATES: Yes, there is --

REP. CONAWAY: Is there going to -- is --

SEC. GATES: There is only one F-35 to replace an F-15 that we lost.

REP. CONAWAY: So the F-35 is going to go into the fight?

SEC. GATES: Well, what we have done actually for the last several years is when we have lost an aircraft, for example, and when the line for that particular aircraft is closed; we then move to the next most modern aircraft.

REP. CONAWAY: Okay. We've got 111 C-5s?

SEC. GATES: Yes.

REP. CONAWAY: The testimony the previous couple of years is that 50 of them or some odd, 50 of them can't get off the ground, never will get off the ground again. Not getting into the C-17 fight. I don't have any C-5s in my district; there aren't any C-17s in my district.

But it seems to me that -- letting us know what it cost us year in and year out to maintain the tale numbers on the C-5s that -- and the 111 -- that those resources that could go somewhere else. And I know we've got champions on my side of the aisle and the other side of the aisle to keep all 111 C-5s on the books. But it seems to me that we ought to at least know the wasted resources that that cost us to maintain that. So --

SEC. GATES: We will provide you with that information. But I will tell you as I told you last year and the year before, and as the Admiral just described a few minutes earlier in this hearing, the Air Force cannot recapitalize unless it retires some older aircraft. We have sought from the Congress the authority to retire some C-5s, and have not received that authority. And we would really like to get it.

REP. CONAWAY: Well, if you'll give us the amount of money to be redeployed somewhere else by retiring planes that will never leave the ground again, it would be very helpful to support that argument.

I yield back, Mr. Chairman.

REP. SKELTON: Thank the gentleman.

Ms. Giffords.

REP. GABRIELLE GIFFORDS (D-AZ): Thank you Mr. Chairman, Secretary Gates, Admiral Mullen and Secretary Hale. Thank you so much for your service.

I've got a couple of questions. Following up on an aircraft, I know after long last, we now have some numbers from the department that indicate that we're going to lower the requirement for manned fighter aircraft by 206 airplanes. And overall, I believe this represents a reduction of 536 aircraft from two years ago. I'm talking about strike fighters of course.

So we're looking at maybe a shortfall between 217 and 224; and that these retirements are not offset by the joint strike fighter. So I'm concerned. Congressman LoBiondo and I have worked on this for a couple of years. And obviously there is a lot of pressure on the budget, but I was just hoping to get your perspective on this gap that we're facing.

SEC. GATES: Sure. Between -- we have roughly 2,240 - 45 combat aircraft now. That number is projected to drop to 1,864 in 2020; that's a drop of 377. On the other hand, unmanned aircraft such as the Reaper will increase from 204 now to 543. So if you count all the aircraft and the un-remotely piloted aircraft, you actually end up with a difference between 2,440 now and 2,400, 2,407 in 2020.

And it goes back to the point that I made earlier; given the increased capabilities of planes like the F-22 and the F-35, with advanced sensing and stealth and so on; there is really no reason to replace them on a one-for-one basis. And as the chairman said earlier, and as we just discussed, unless the Air Force can retire some of these third generation and even fourth generation legacy aircraft, they will not have the money to recapitalize.

ADM. MULLEN: The only thing I'd add to that ma'am is that I don't know of a major program that we decommissioned and we replaced it with the same number. I may be wrong but in aircraft, ships, missiles my experience is that because of the higher end capability, the technology investment required, the costs; that we just have not replaced them one for one. And we haven't needed to do that.

REP. GIFFORDS: Well thank you. This is an ongoing discussion and of course there are concerns here -- an unmanned aircraft are very capable, but obviously they can't replace manned aircraft. They're just different, they serve different purposes.

I want to shift gears to an area that I know both of you are working on; and that is the dependence that we have on foreign countries for our energy. And of course, the world's largest user of energy is actually the Air Force. In the United States, the largest user of energy is the Department of Defense. And the department has taken tremendous steps to reduce the amount of energy being used by the Department of Defense.

I'm curious about comments on your short-term and your long-term energy reduction goals. Also, whether or not the energy-saving performance contracts are proving to be worthwhile. And what Congress can do to help streamline some of these projects. My frustration is we spend over \$400 billion every year to buy energy from mostly hostile foreign nations. And it puts us from a national defense standpoint really in a very precarious situation.

And this Congress I believe is very committed to making sure that we can make America's energy in America, and you all are on the front lines of that. So I was hoping to get some comments on this question.

SEC. GATES: I think to give you an adequate answer we'd probably better do that for the record.

REP. GIFFORDS: Okay.

Admiral Mullen.

ADM. MULLEN: Well, I would -- I would agree with that. For an in-depth answer, I know the Air Force has led the department. I know Secretary Mabus in the Navy has made this a priority for the Navy. The Navy was behind in -- invested but behind with respect to that. And it is a priority in the department; and certainly I share -- we all share the concerns that you expressed in terms of where we get it, not just now but in the future.

REP. GIFFORDS: Well, it is interesting you look at for example Mellis Air Force Base and how much of their energy is now coming from solar. Luke Air Force Base is on target to actually a larger installation. Davis-Monthan Air Force Base probably double that. So it's interesting from a facilities standpoint the progress that's been made. But from the operational standpoint, when you look at biofuel and the ability to not have these long -- there's a frightening snapshot photograph. It's the caravan for you know the oil re-supplier for you know the petroleum resupply that you know kills hundreds of our soldiers every year.

And you all are the forefront of that. And I see some of that reflected in the budget. We worked here in the House to nominate -- to put together a director of operational energy; and we're hoping the Senate confirms that to be able to help free up your work. So thank you and I look forward to working with you on that.

REP. SKELTON: Thank the gentle lady.

Ms. McMorris Rodgers

REP. CAHTY MCMORRIS RODGERS (R-WA): Thank you Mr. Chairman and thank you Secretary Gates and Admiral Mullen for being here. I know that it's been a long day for you. But I just thank you for the generosity of your time in answering our questions.

As you know, I represent Fairchild Air Force Base. And the tanker and the replacement of the tankers has been on the forefront of my priority list since I arrived in Congress. And for one reason or another, we've seen a number of delays in the process.

The Casey-135 represents a central piece of war plans to support the United States and its allies around the world. And now, Northrop Grumman's chief operating officer has threatened to not bid unless significant changes are made to the tanker requirements. And I think I join with others in just sharing a concern about the potential of further delaying the tanker competition and stretching the limits of these 50-year-old aircraft.

I want to see a new tanker parked on the ramps of Fairchild Air Force Base sooner rather than later. So I want to just ask, how are you going to respond to this kind of pressure and change the war fighter's tanker requirements to meet the demands of the competitors?

SEC. GATES: The -- we've received a lot of comments, including from here on Capitol Hill on the RFP. I think that the final RFP will be issued in a fairly short period of time. And our hope is -- I think a selection in the summer. Yeah, a selection in the summer.

We hope very much that there will be a real competition. We hope very much that both competitors stay in the competition. But should that not prove to be the case, we will -- we have to move forward for all the reasons you cite. It's been delayed too long. We need to get this thing started.

REP. MCMORRIS RODGERS: Good, good to hear.

And Admiral Mullen, I just want to applaud you for your support of military families. And I know the administration is really taking a new -- provided a new emphasis on supporting our military families, and the Department of Defense likewise. We are seeing the impact of multiple deployments on our military families. And I'm hearing from families across the country about mental-health issues.

What are we going to do to increase access and utilization of mental-health services for our military families?

ADM. MULLEN: Again, this has been a priority for this department for several years. We have more than tripled the number of mental- health-care providers in recent years, but we're still far short of what we need. I talked earlier about the whole issue of -- we've got to address internally to the military and families.

Deborah, who's here today, hears from spouses all the time about the stress they're under. And it's not PTS, but there are PTS-like symptoms associated with that. And many of them have said they're worried about raising their hand for fear that it may impact on their husband or their wife's career as well; so an awful lot of effort going after this.

Where I am on this is we've got to start producing a higher- capacity output to address this issue, and it's a very, very complex issue. And I'd also like to thank you and Mr. Bishop for standing up the Military Family Caucus. That's a big deal. And it will focus issues, and do so in a way that is fed by your concerns and your reaching out to families to get information about what's going on and allow us all to continue to press forward to make it better for them, because they are so important.

MR. HALE: Can I add briefly?

REP. MCMORRIS RODGERS: Please.

MR. HALE: I think an exciting experiment -- the Army is trying to screen members who are coming back from Iraq and Afghanistan for mental-health disorders over either the Internet or video teleconference to make greater use of health professionals.

REP. MCMORRIS RODGERS: Well, good.

MR. HALE: They tried it in an experiment at Tripler. It worked out quite well. A lot of the younger soldiers really liked it because they're so used to working over the Internet. And it would allow greater use or better utilization of health professionals. So I think they plan to expand it. It's a good idea; forward-thinking.

REP. MCMORRIS RODGERS: Great. Thanks.

And Admiral Mullen, and to your wife Deborah, I do appreciate your leadership and your support of providing the support for our military families that is so desperately needed.

And with that, I'll yield back.

ADM. MULLEN: Ma'am, the only thing I'd add, on top of what Mr. Hale said, is there have been -- there has been more than one result from what I would call anonymous counseling; in other words, over the Internet, don't know who the counselor -- you don't -- and it is a way to get at the stigma piece. And I'd like to see us expand that in a way where we can reach a larger number.

REP. MCMORRIS RODGERS: Well, and I think there's some exciting technology with the -- you know, we've done the virtual recruiters. Maybe we can do virtual counselors and, you know, protect the soldier themselves.

Okay, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

REP. SKELTON: I thank the gentlelady.

We have two members who wish to have a second round. We will get you out very much near your deadline of 3:00.

Mr. Taylor.

REP. TAYLOR: Thank you, Admiral and Secretary Gates, for sticking around so long.

I did not give you any opportunity, I regret to say, to respond to my concerns about the use of rules of engagement that were raised on my visit to Afghanistan. And Mr. Secretary, I have noticed, since the publication of the book "Lone Survivor," this is something that comes up fairly often as I meet with the moms and dads and loved ones of troops deployed. And it's a very serious question.

I realize where General McChrystal is trying to go. But when those two troopers brought it to my attention -- again, their concerns about the use of the Afghan police; in particular, another observation was that they were concerned that we have stopped prohibiting vehicular traffic from transiting along with our convoys, that they were very concerned about vehicle-borne IEDs.

And so, again, you know, you are the secretary of Defense -- and I did ask General McChrystal. I said, "Did you write the rules of engagement yourself, or did they come from other places?" And I think his answer was it was a combination of what his suggestions and Washington. So, again, I would ask you to address those concerns.

SEC. GATES: Well, both of us will take a crack at this.

I'm obviously aware of this concern on the part of some of our soldiers. I heard this directly from a young soldier at Walter Reed a couple of years -- a couple of weeks ago, who told me that he thought the reason he'd been injured was because of the rules of engagement.

It seems to me that this is an area where I believe that the commander on the ground has to have the discretion in terms of the rules of engagement for the troops and how the rules of engagement fit with the strategy he is trying to pursue.

The tactics that have been used by us are changing all the time. There's been a significant reduction in the use of dogs because they're so offensive to the Afghans. There's been a significant reduction in night raids.

And frankly, there is -- you know, we had a situation. I'll give you an example of where you can make a mistake, and it actually was with, I think, one of the Predators. And they saw a group of people digging a hole in a road, and they were going to target the Predator on them because they were convinced they were doing an IED. And the guy running the Predator stopped it at the last minute. People were on the ground, and it was a bunch of kids, and they were just fooling around. They weren't planting bombs. Hitting those kids would have been a huge setback for us in that area.

So I basically -- I understand their concern. I've heard from parents as well about it and their worry. I understand it. But I think that in terms of the overall health of our force and keeping our

kids safe, that being successful in this campaign is really the priority. And we're obviously going to do everything we can in the course of that to protect our kids. But we also have to figure out what the best strategy for success is.

ADM. MULLEN: I would only add that I think your comment and the comment that was made to you by the soldier you met with about the police is an accurate comment, and we're all concerned about that. And that's the Afghan police are the long pole in the tent, because in many places they're corrupt. And where (we're ?) willing to follow a soldier -- sorry -- an Afghan soldier in, not so. And we're working our way through that. And I think everybody in the chain of command recognizes that.

My experience along these lines, back to who wrote it, at least I think I would attribute the initial directive that General McChrystal put in place to reduce civilian casualties, which is what this is a lot about, Washington was involved in that. Subsequent to that, I'm not aware that we participate at all in the (house piece ?); you know, his directive with respect to night raids. That really is his business, and he feels very strongly. And I would only re-emphasize what the secretary said about it's important that he do that.

The other thing in my conversations with soldiers out there, it is -- it has been -- those who were in Iraq -- and I think I heard you say that as well -- who had tours in Iraq that come to Afghanistan for the first time, and they see the rules of engagement being so much different. We worked our way through that in Iraq over time and found we could do that as we were learning.

In this insurgency, we know what we need to do, and I think we need to do it earlier. We didn't know that at that time in Iraq. We had to work our way through it. They have expressed those same concerns about the convoys, and at the same time -- and there are risks associated with that.

I believe that General McChrystal in particular believes, and we all do, that we're going to get through this more quickly, and in the end suffer fewer casualties. And the risk may be up on the front end.

What this is all about is how we treat the Afghan people, how we treat where they live, and how we impact them in terms of this overall campaign. That's the center of gravity. And we are protecting -- I mean, a priority for us is certainly to make sure we take care of our people who are fighting.

REP. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, a quick question for the record, if you don't mind.

REP. SKELTON: Go ahead.

REP. TAYLOR: I would be very interested in how many troopers have faced either judicial or non-judicial punishment in Afghanistan for violating the rules of engagement and give us some sort of a benchmark of the size of this problem.

Thank you very much, gentlemen.

REP. SKELTON: Thank you.

Mr. McKeon.

REP. MCKEON: Again, I join the others in thanking you for the time that you've given us here today, gentlemen.

In my opening remarks, I talked about \$350 million in the budget for either supporting detainee operations in Guantanamo Bay or any other location. I think you used the term \$150 million. Was that on some other --

SEC. GATES: That was just for the prison in Illinois. The \$350 (million) is all detainee operations --

REP. MCKEON: Okay.

SEC. GATES: -- including Guantanamo.

MR. HALE: The \$150 (million), as the secretary said, for MILCON. There would also be, if we opened the Thompson facility, some startup costs, another perhaps \$150 (million) for IT security upgrades. It will be a very high-security facility if it's opened. So the total would be around \$300 (million). And then there's a couple of hundred (million dollars), as you pointed out, to buy the facility in the Department of Justice budget.

REP. MCKEON: Great. We're all on the same page, then, on that.

Mr. Secretary, it's the administration's -- is it the administration's policy to prevent Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons?

SEC. GATES: Yes.

REP. MCKEON: What steps is the department taking to meet this objective?

SEC. GATES: Well, I think that, first of all, to give you any kind of a comprehensive answer to that question, we probably should do it on the record -- in a classified session or with a classified response. But I think we are looking at a full range of options.

REP. MCKEON: In the State of the Union, the president stated that if Iran pursues a nuclear-weapons capability, there would be growing consequences. Can you explain what these growing consequences are? Would that also have to be --

SEC. GATES: Well, I think, in the near term, it's more likely to be severe sanctions imposed, partly by the U.N. Security Council and partly by the U.S. and like-minded countries.

REP. MCKEON: Finally, I understand that the Iran Military Power Report, Section 1245, from last year's -- or this year's -- yeah, last year's NDAA has missed its deadline and will be delivered late to the Congress. Can you please ensure that we get this report as soon as possible?

ADM. MULLEN: Sure.

REP. MCKEON: These other questions we'll just submit for the record. You've been here a long time.

Thank you very much for all you're doing.

SEC. GATES: Thank you.

REP. SKELTON: Let me thank each of you for your appearance today, for your outstanding service to your country. You know, we talk about families, but I'm not sure anyone has said thank you for your families.

Secretary Gates, your charming wife Becky is the sponsor of the USS Missouri and makes us all proud, the fact that she is.

Admiral Mullen, your lovely wife Deb has done so much with you and for you. And I'm not supposed to introduce her today, so I won't. But it is awfully nice to have her with us to share this moment. Thank you so much.

And Secretary Hale, we didn't give you too much of a workout today, but we'll save you for the next time.

Thank you, and we're adjourned.

LOAD-DATE: February 4, 2010

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

PUBLICATION-TYPE: Transcript

Copyright 2010 Federal News Service, Inc.
All Rights Reserved